



Monroe County &



Monroe County Bar Association Assigned Counsel Program 2001 Annual Report

Monroe County

Jack Doyle, County Executive

Gary Pence, Director of Public Safety

Richard W. Youngman, Esq., ACP Administrator

Monroe County Bar Association

Michael C. Dwyer, Esq., President

Hon. Thomas Rainbow Morse, Advisory Committee Chair

May 17, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	2
<i>"To Provide Quality Representation".....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>"To Provide A Coordinated And Centralized Assignment System For Conflict Cases".....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>"To Provide A More Equitable Distribution Of Conflict Assignments Among Lawyers".....</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>"To Attract More Lawyers Willing To Handle Conflict Assignments".....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>"To Maintain Uniform And Proper Billing Practices And To Ensure Cost Accountability Of Services".....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>"To Provide Increased Efficiency For The Courts".....</i>	<i>4</i>
2002 GOALS.....	5
2001 APPROVED PANEL LIST	6
TOTAL CASES REFERRED BY PANEL 1997-2001¹	11
2001 ASSIGNMENTS.....	12
2001 ABC FELONY ASSIGNMENTS	13
2001 DE FELONY ASSIGNMENTS	15
2001 MISDEMEANOR ASSIGNMENTS	18
2001 FAMILY COURT ASSIGNMENTS	24
2001 CASE DISTRIBUTION GRAPHS¹	28
2001 TABLE OF PROGRAM USE BY JUDICIARY	29
GRAPHS OF PROGRAM USE BY JUDICIARY	34
TYPES OF CASES ASSIGNED IN 2001	35
2001 CASE COSTS BY PANEL.....	41
2001 COSTS BY CASE DISPOSITION	42

Introduction

2001 was the tenth year the Assigned Counsel Program operated in all courts. The following statistical information shows the Program's relative success in meeting the goals of the Monroe County Bar Association Sponsored Plan for Conflict Assignments as stated below.

"The objectives of this conflict assignments plan are to provide quality representation to eligible indigent defendants or other litigants in those cases where the Public Defender has a conflict of interest; to provide a coordinated and centralized assignment system for conflict cases arising in the courts specified in Article IV herein, to provide a more equitable distribution of conflict assignments among lawyers; to attract more lawyers willing to handle conflict assignments, to maintain uniform and proper billing practices; to ensure cost accountability of services, and to provide increased efficiency for the courts by making qualified attorneys more readily available to handle conflict cases." *Monroe County Bar Association Sponsored Plan for Conflict Assignments*, ARTICLE II. Plan Objectives

"To Provide Quality Representation"

The Program received nineteen initial complaints involving questionable, unethical or illegal conduct by participating attorneys. This is up from fourteen in 2000. Clients were the source of seventeen complaints. The Monroe County Bar Association referred two complaints filed by clients. The Program has jurisdiction over open cases only. After investigation, the Assigned Counsel Program closed all complaints with no action taken against the attorney. All complaints were disposed of either by the attorney and client reaching a mutually acceptable understanding or by the attorney's withdrawal from the case with the permission of the court. The Program removed no attorneys from the panel lists due to suspension or disbarment by the Appellate Division.

All complaints required only administrative action. No referral to the Assigned Counsel Program Review Committee was necessary. Failure of the attorney to maintain contact with incarcerated clients was the most frequent complaint. Failure of the attorney to appear prepared to proceed was again the most frequent complaint from the courts. One complaint concerning an allegation that the assigned attorney slept through the trial was for a closed case over which the program has no jurisdiction. The matter was referred to appellate counsel for investigation and possible inclusion in the client's appeal.

The Program's Motion and Brief Bank now contains several hundred documents. No index is yet available. However, in 2001 more motions and other documents were converted to electronic format and posted on the Program's Internet web site. Access to the documents is restricted to Program participants.

In 2001, the Program started an electronic newsletter. The newsletter was sent on a weekly basis to all panel members providing e-mail addresses to the Program. The weekly e-newsletter provides the panel members with more current and timely information than the printed newsletter of the past. The Program not only saved money in postage and printing, but was able to increase the number of newsletters sent to the panel members. Information of a critical nature was sent conventionally and throughout 2001 the Program sent the panel attorneys various bulletins, broadcast faxes, and newsletters informing the panel members of upcoming seminars and events and encouraging them to take advantage of the opportunities offered by these programs to increase their knowledge and legal skills.

Since the CLE requirements of the Assigned Counsel Program overlap with the Mandatory Continuing Legal Education requirements of the State of New York, compliance is near 100%. The Program co-sponsored a CLE seminar with the New York State Association of Criminal Defense Attorneys and the New York State Defenders Association.

The Program's computer hardware and software systems were upgraded during 2001 and improvements were made to the database. The Administrator upgraded and improved the Program's Internet site with better graphics and more information, more links to other sites of interest to panel members and the news and notes section was made more timely. Documents were added to the Motion and Brief Bank section of the web site.

"To Provide A Coordinated And Centralized Assignment System For Conflict Cases"

The Assigned Counsel Program is fully computerized. The Program enters all cases reported to it in a centralized database that tracks the representation from assignment through payment of the voucher. This system avoids duplication of representation by showing all open case for a particular client thus insuring that there is a continuity of representation if the client is arrested on new charges. This system also promptly closes any case thus clearing any potential conflict of interest that the Public Defender might have in representing the client in future case.

During 2001, the Program started a project to upgrade and enhance the case management program to provide more and faster information. Assignments referred by the courts continue to be assigned from a rotating list of available attorneys. The Program, thanks to the dedicated efforts of Toni Armstrong, is very successful in insuring continuity of counsel where a client is re-arrested on new charges even when the arrests span differing jurisdictions. Additionally, the Program continues to track conflict of interest information so that counsel is not unnecessarily assigned when the Public Defender could ethically continue.

"To Provide A More Equitable Distribution Of Conflict Assignments Among Lawyers"

While not perfect, the Program does achieve a significant improvement over the previous system of assignment of conflict cases. The Program constantly strives for new and better systems to distribute assignments more equitably among the participating attorneys. In criminal cases, the current system is highly effective. There are still several local criminal courts that do not fully utilize the services of the Program in the assignment of counsel. This sometimes leads to a client having multiple attorneys for different pending charges.

A reduction both in the number of attorneys accepting assignments and number of assignments accepted by attorneys who still take assignments, led to a situation where, as in 2000, the distribution of cases was not as uniform as in past years. Experienced attorneys are accepting fewer and fewer assigned cases, especially in serious felony cases. While the Program has experienced only an 8% reduction in the number of attorneys on the panels (compared to a statewide 30-40% reduction), the attorneys remaining are taking fewer cases. This leads to a situation where a smaller number of attorneys are bearing the burden of assigned cases.

Passage of pending legislation raising the hourly rates paid under Article 18-B of the County Law will address this problem. The proposed rate would go from \$25 per hour for out of court work and \$40 per hour for in court work to a fixed \$75 per hour for felony and Family Court cases and \$60 per hour for misdemeanor cases. Most attorneys resigning from the Program or taking a reduced number of cases cite the low hourly rates as the reason for resignation or reduced activity. When it becomes difficult for an attorney to meet overhead expenses under the current rates, the attorney, no matter how dedicated, is forced to either resign or reduce the number of cases accepted.

Equitable distribution of cases remains low in Family Court cases. A mechanism must be found to address the inequities in Family Court assignments. The fact that a very few attorneys receive the bulk of the assignments places an undue burden on those attorneys and can impact directly on the quality of representation. More training through the appropriate committee of the Bar Association is necessary to familiarize the panel attorneys with local Family Court practice. The panel requirements should be reviewed with the Family Court judges to see if they are stringent enough. Lack of confidence in the quality of representation is a possible factor in the Judges' reluctance to use the full services offered by the Assigned Counsel Program. A Family Court component of a Trial Institute might alleviate the concern of the Family Court judges regarding the training of assigned counsel.

"To Attract More Lawyers Willing To Handle Conflict Assignments"

Included in this report is a list of new panel members added during 2001. In 2001, the Administrator spoke to newly admitted attorneys at a seminar sponsored by the Young Lawyers Committee of the Monroe County Bar Association to promote participation in the Assigned Counsel Program.

Although the Program takes every opportunity to remind the current panel members to apply for the more restrictive panels once they achieve the requisite qualifications, in 2001 the Program experienced a drop in the number of qualified felony attorneys. Due to retirement, relocation and an inability to continue taking assigned cases at the current statutory rates, attorneys resigned from the Assigned Counsel Program and took fewer assignments, especially in serious felony cases. The requirements for inclusion on a felony panel include having conducted a misdemeanor jury trial or participated in jury selection in such a case coupled with conduct of a bench trial. Since so few misdemeanor trials are held each year, it is difficult for an attorney to meet this requirement.

Recruitment of newly admitted attorneys is hampered by the low statutory rates. With student loans to repay, office expenses to meet and families to provide for, many newly admitted attorneys realize before they even start that accepting assigned cases is a financial burden that cannot be borne.

"To Maintain Uniform And Proper Billing Practices And To Ensure Cost Accountability Of Services"

The Program continues to process a routine voucher and send it to the Judge within 48 hours of receipt. The Administrator reviews each voucher before processing to insure compliance with the voucher regulations and notifies each attorney of any noncompliance to educate the attorney on proper procedures. The review and notification help maintain proper and uniform billing practices among the participating attorneys.

"To Provide Increased Efficiency For The Courts"

Those courts fully utilizing the services of the Assigned Counsel Program report a positive impact on the efficiency in obtaining assigned counsel in conflict cases. They report a significant decrease in the burden on the court staff in finding attorneys willing to accept assignments, a decrease in the number of phone calls necessary to contact an attorney for assignment, a decrease in the voucher processing time since the vouchers are now clearly labeled as to the matter and already reviewed with comments by the Administrator, and a prompt response from the Assigned Counsel Program in obtaining assigned counsel.

In 1992, the County Executives Office began a program of training in Total Quality Management for the employees of Monroe County. That training continues. This training increases the efficiency of the internal operation and makes the Program more responsive to the needs of the Courts and the participating attorneys. The Strategic Framework of the Assigned Counsel Program is complete and development and refinement of the key result measures continues.

2002 Goals

The following are the goals for 2002:

- Implementation of a Homicide panel after the standards adopted by the Monroe County Bar Association are provided to the Administrator
- Promote the use of the WestLaw research terminal in the Program offices. This research capability should increase the efficiency of assigned counsel, improve the quality of representation and reduce costs.
- Continue scanning of selected documents from the Motion and Brief Bank so panel members can obtain electronic copies of the documents and so they can continue to be posted on the Internet for downloading.
- Recruit more attorneys for the felony panels.
- Develop web based database solution to replace customer service lost when we were unable to replace lost personnel.
- Develop any necessary procedures to comply with the anticipated State of New York standards and requirements accompanying state contribution to increased assigned counsel fees under Article 18-B of the County Law.
- Work with the Law Department on more aggressive collection of past due contribution orders issued pursuant to §722-d of the County Law of the State of New York.

2001 Approved Panel List

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Anderson, Christopher				x	1
Annechino, John A.		x	x	x	3
Aramini, Mary E.	x	x	x	x	4
Aureli, Daniel L.	x	x		x	3
Barr, Culver K.	x	x			2
Bernacki, Jr., John E.			x	x	2
Bertram, Dudley M.			x	x	2
Bitetti, Gary	x	x		x	3
Bourtis, Eftihia				x	1
Brooker, James G.				x	1
Brown, J. Raymond	x	x		x	3
Bryant, Kevin C.			x	x	2
Buettner, Brian C.			x	x	2
Burke, Adrian J.	x	x		x	3
Callanan, Karen Smith			x		1
Castellano, June			x		1
Chait, Mitchell A.				x	1
Cianca, Mark F.		x		x	2
Cocuzzi, Thomas J.	x	x		x	3
Colombo, Jeanne M.		x	x	x	3
Conaty, Jr., George W.	x	x			2
Cooper, Jennie M.			x	x	2
Costello, Paul Keely			x		1
Crimi, Joseph P.	x	x	x	x	4
Crimi, Jr., Charles F.				x	1

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Damelio, Joseph S.	x	x			2
Daniele, Anthony	x	x		x	3
D'Arpino, John Joseph			x	x	2
Dedes, William C.				x	1
DeJohn, Timothy W.	x	x	x	x	4
Dimassimo, James D.			x	x	2
Dinolfo, Joseph F.			x	x	2
DiSalvo, Thomas J.	x	x	x	x	4
Egger, Jan P.	x	x		x	3
Enos, Gregory E.			x		1
Farr, William H.			x		1
Farrell-Gallagher, Barbara E.	x	x	x	x	4
Fazio, Jennifer L.			x		1
Feldman, Sammy			x		1
Flowerday, Michael D.		x	x	x	3
Funk, Mark D.	x	x	x	x	4
Garretson, Scott A.	x	x		x	3
Gladstone, Katherine			x	x	2
Goldman, Ronald S.				x	1
Gross, Bryon W.				x	1
Hardies, Robert M.				x	1
Hilderbrandt, Randall D.			x		1
Hinman, James S.	x	x	x	x	4
Holliday, Billie D.	x	x	x	x	4
Hurwitz, Phillip R.		x	x	x	3
Indivino, Deborah A.			x		1
Jain, Rekha			x	x	2

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Kantor, Theodore S.			x		1
Karatas, Nigos			x	x	2
Kasperek, Lawrence L.	x	x			2
Khuns, Kevin M.				x	1
King, Jr., William H.			x	x	2
Kosoff-Roth, Karen L.			x	x	2
Krane, Joel N.	x	x		x	3
Kristal, Peter L.	x	x	x	x	4
LaBue, Eugene P.				x	1
LaCelle, Erik C.				x	1
LaDuca, John J.				x	1
Lahman, Janice A.			x	x	2
Leegant, Jo Anne	x	x	x	x	4
Leichtner, Edward J.			x		1
Lester, Frederick		x	x	x	3
Levitt, Glenn R.			x		1
Lewis, Herbert J.	x	x	x		3
Maggio, Frank G.				x	1
Mastrella, Daniel J.		x		x	2
Merante, Vincent E.		x		x	2
Misseritti, Giuliana			x		1
Morabito, David R.	x	x	x	x	4
Murante, David A.	x	x		x	3
Murch, David R.			x		1
Napier, James A.		x		x	2
Napier, Robert A.	x				1
Nesser, Joseph G.			x		1

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Nicosia, Edward G.			x		1
Obiorah, Edwin S.C.	x	x	x	x	4
Offen, Alan L.			x		1
O'Neill, Jr., Raymond B.				x	1
O'Toole, Keith				x	1
Owens, David L.		x	x	x	3
Parks, Anthony		x		x	2
Parrinello, J. Matthew				x	1
Pennica, Kenneth L.			x	x	2
Perez, Gilbert R.	x	x	x	x	4
Pilato, Louis P.	x	x	x	x	4
Proano, Galo M.			x	x	2
Pullano, Peter J.	x	x		x	3
Redmond, Gregg H.				x	1
Renzi, Alexander R.	x	x	x	x	4
Rizzo, James J.	x	x		x	3
Ryan, Diana Deyo			x		1
Sadinsky, Lisa A.			x	x	2
Sammons, Elizabeth A.			x		1
Santariello, Michael				x	1
Scatigno, John M.			x		1
Schell, George A.			x		1
Schiano, Christopher		x		x	2
Schiano, Jr., Charles A.	x	x		x	3
Schiano, Margaret A.			x		1
Schiano, Michael P.	x	x		x	3
Scibetta, Michael P.				x	1

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Sekharan, Raja N.			x	x	2
Shapiro, Robert A.	x	x		x	3
Shulman, Brian J.	x	x	x	x	4
Snodgrass, Cynthia L.			x		1
Solomon, R. Adrian		x		x	2
St. George, Robert J.			x		1
Stacy, Michael P.		x	x	x	3
Strazzeri, Francis A.	x	x			2
Summers, Reed Noble				x	1
Teator, Mary E.			x	x	2
Thompson, Donald M.	x	x			2
Tuohey, Michael J.	x	x	x	x	4
Vacca, James P.	x	x	x	x	4
West, John R.			x	x	2
Wisner, Todd J.W.		x		x	2
Wood, Robert W.		x		x	2
Wurtz, Edward A.			x	x	2
Zaretsky, Allen J.			x		1
Zunno, Harriet L.			x		1
Total # Attorneys	41	56	73	91	261


New Attorneys in 2001*

Name	ABC	DE	Family Court	Misdemeanor	# Panels
Annechino, John A.	x				
Zaretsky, Allen J.		x		x	2

* Panel for which the attorney was approved in 2001. Attorney may have been approved in a previous year for a different panel or panels.

Total Cases Referred by Panel 1997-2001¹

Panel	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
ABC Felony	557	646	740	654	593
DE Felony	420	409	383	381	449
Misdemeanor	1398	1444	1566	1467	1413
Family Court	1031	1023	1073	1124	1139
Appellate	21	77	75	55	37
Probation/Parole	162	193	191	184	204
Other	47	39	32	30	36



1. Does not represent number of assignments made, only initial cases referred for assignment.

2001 Assignments

The following charts show the assignments each attorney received in 2001. The number of assignments is higher than the number of cases referred because in some cases more than one attorney receives an assignment for a case. Also, an attorney might be assigned in 2001 to a case originally referred in a previous year. This occurs most often after a court relieves one attorney and either the court or the Assigned Counsel Program assigns a new attorney.

Several factors should be considered in looking at these tables. First, approved panel members receive more assignments than non-approved panel members do. Some of the attorneys with a low number of assignments are non-approved panel members. Most often, such an attorney is court assigned. Secondly, those attorneys gaining membership on a panel for the first time during 2001 will have fewer assignments in that panel because they were not on the panel for an entire year. Thirdly, an increasing number of attorneys declined a significant number of assignments, requested removal from the Program for long periods of time or resigned from the Program during 2001, especially the attorneys on the ABC felony panel. While the report includes non-approved attorneys, new panel members, attorneys declining appointments, and attorneys temporarily removed from panels at their own request, concentrating on those members who participated for the full year as approved members of a particular panel gives a truer picture of the equitable distribution of assignments.

The success of the program in achieving equitable distribution of cases is still excellent even when including all the attorneys and despite the decreasing number of participants. It is very good when concentrating on attorneys who started the year on a particular panel. The last column of each table contains a running percentage of the total assignments. The more attorneys listed in a table before the percentage reaches fifty suggests a more equitable case distribution in that panel.

Of particular significance in this report is the fact that in the criminal courts, where the Assigned Counsel Program assigns a large percentage of cases, there is a more even distribution of assignments. This is attributable to the fact that, by comparison, Family Court has a much lower percentage of cases assigned by the Assigned Counsel Program. Most assignments are directly by the court. Attaining more equitable distribution of cases is difficult, if not impossible. The Administrator and Advisory Committee must work diligently to provide a workable solution to the inequities of the Family Court assignments. Looking at the last column of the tables, it takes significantly fewer attorneys for the Family Court assignments to reach a high percentage than it does for the criminal court assignments.

2001 ABC Felony Assignments

Attorney	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Shapiro, Robert A.	40	4	44	7.6%	44	7.6%
Kristal, Peter L.	29	3	32	5.5%	76	13.2%
Hinman, James S.	23	5	28	4.9%	104	18.0%
Pilato, Louis P.	22	6	28	4.9%	132	22.9%
Garretson, Scott A.	26	1	27	4.7%	159	27.6%
Krane, Joel N.	16	10	26	4.5%	185	32.1%
Funk, Mark D.	20	4	24	4.2%	209	36.2%
Shulman, Brian J.	16	8	24	4.2%	233	40.4%
Bourtis, Eftihia	20	1	21	3.6%	254	44.0%
Egger, Jan P.	17	1	18	3.1%	272	47.1%
Obiorah, Edwin S.C.	15	2	17	2.9%	289	50.1%
Farrell, Barbara E.	12	5	17	2.9%	306	53.0%
Leegant, Jo Anne	13	1	14	2.4%	320	55.5%
Brown, J. Raymond	13	0	13	2.3%	333	57.7%
Crimi, Joseph P.	11	2	13	2.3%	346	60.0%
Schiano, Michael P.	10	3	13	2.3%	359	62.2%
Holliday, Billie D.	11	1	12	2.1%	371	64.3%
Barr, Culver K.	10	2	12	2.1%	383	66.4%
Thompson, Donald M.	10	2	12	2.1%	395	68.5%
Kasperek, Lawrence L.	7	5	12	2.1%	407	70.5%
Rizzo, James J.	9	1	10	1.7%	417	72.3%
Damelio, Joseph S.	1	9	10	1.7%	427	74.0%
DiSalvo, Thomas J.	7	2	9	1.6%	436	75.6%
Morabito, David R.	7	2	9	1.6%	445	77.1%
Vacca, James P.	8	0	8	1.4%	453	78.5%

Attorney	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Murante, David A.	7	1	8	1.4%	461	79.9%
Perez, Gilbert R.	7	1	8	1.4%	469	81.3%
Schiano, Jr., Charles A.	7	1	8	1.4%	477	82.7%
Renzi, Alexander R.	6	2	8	1.4%	485	84.1%
Aureli, Daniel L.	7	0	7	1.2%	492	85.3%
Pullano, Peter J.	4	3	7	1.2%	499	86.5%
Cocuzzi, Thomas J.	1	6	7	1.2%	506	87.7%
Lewis, Herbert J.	6	0	6	1.0%	512	88.7%
Rose, Angelo A.	0	6	6	1.0%	518	89.8%
Conaty, Jr., George W.	4	1	5	0.9%	523	90.6%
Schiano, Christopher	0	5	5	0.9%	528	91.5%
Aramini, Mary E.	4	0	4	0.7%	532	92.2%
Hanlon, Garry Stephen	4	0	4	0.7%	536	92.9%
Murray, D. Michael	4	0	4	0.7%	540	93.6%
Lappan, James	3	1	4	0.7%	544	94.3%
Annechino, John A.	3	0	3	0.5%	547	94.8%
Strazzeri, Francis A.	3	0	3	0.5%	550	95.3%
Bitetti, Gary	2	1	3	0.5%	553	95.8%
Regenstreif, Jeffrey G.	2	0	2	0.3%	555	96.2%
Tuohey, Michael J.	2	0	2	0.3%	557	96.5%
Owens, David L.	1	1	2	0.3%	559	96.9%
Zimmermann, Jr., Clark J.	1	1	2	0.3%	561	97.2%
Daniele, Anthony	0	2	2	0.3%	563	97.6%
Flowerday, Michael D.	0	2	2	0.3%	565	97.9%
Green, Scott M.	0	2	2	0.3%	567	98.3%
Rath, Timothy C.	0	2	2	0.3%	569	98.6%

Attorney	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Bertram, Dudley M.	1	0	1	0.2%	570	98.8%
DeJohn, Timothy W.	1	0	1	0.2%	571	99.0%
Leonardo, Stephen M.	1	0	1	0.2%	572	99.1%
Pineau, Maureen A.	1	0	1	0.2%	573	99.3%
Wood, Robert W.	1	0	1	0.2%	574	99.5%
Bernacki, Jr., John E.	0	1	1	0.2%	575	99.7%
Goldberg, Richard A.	0	1	1	0.2%	576	99.8%
LaDuca, Anthony	0	1	1	0.2%	577	100.0%
Grand Total	456	121	577			

2001 DE Felony Assignments

Attorney	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Shulman, Brian J.	6	19	25	7.3%	25	7.3%
Shapiro, Robert A.	12	2	14	4.1%	39	11.4%
Garretson, Scott A.	12	1	13	3.8%	52	15.2%
Pilato, Louis P.	11	2	13	3.8%	65	19.0%
Farrell, Barbara E.	9	3	12	3.5%	77	22.4%
Funk, Mark D.	8	4	12	3.5%	89	25.9%
Merante, Vincent E.	9	2	11	3.2%	100	29.2%
Schiano, Christopher	9	2	11	3.2%	111	32.4%
Kristal, Peter L.	9	1	10	2.9%	121	35.3%
Obiorah, Edwin S.C.	8	2	10	2.9%	131	38.2%
Barr, Culver K.	8	0	8	2.3%	139	40.5%
Crimi, Joseph P.	8	0	8	2.3%	147	42.9%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Parks, Anthony	8	0	8	2.3%	155	45.2%
Hinman, James S.	7	1	8	2.3%	163	47.5%
Krane, Joel N.	7	0	7	2.0%	170	49.6%
Schiano, Michael P.	6	1	7	2.0%	177	51.6%
Perez, Gilbert R.	5	2	7	2.0%	184	53.6%
Holliday, Billie D.	4	3	7	2.0%	191	55.7%
Damelio, Joseph S.	1	6	7	2.0%	198	57.7%
Egger, Jan P.	6	0	6	1.7%	204	59.5%
Owens, David L.	6	0	6	1.7%	210	61.2%
Thompson, Donald M.	6	0	6	1.7%	216	63.0%
Vacca, James P.	6	0	6	1.7%	222	64.7%
Bitetti, Gary	1	5	6	1.7%	228	66.5%
Bourtis, Eftihia	5	0	5	1.5%	233	67.9%
Brown, J. Raymond	5	0	5	1.5%	238	69.4%
Hurwitz, Phillip R.	5	0	5	1.5%	243	70.8%
Napier, James A.	4	1	5	1.5%	248	72.3%
Schiano, Jr., Charles A.	4	1	5	1.5%	253	73.8%
Rose, Angelo A.	0	5	5	1.5%	258	75.2%
Wood, Robert W.	4	0	4	1.2%	262	76.4%
Cocuzzi, Thomas J.	3	1	4	1.2%	266	77.6%
DiSalvo, Thomas J.	3	1	4	1.2%	270	78.7%
Rizzo, James J.	3	1	4	1.2%	274	79.9%
Annechino, John A.	3	0	3	0.9%	277	80.8%
Leegant, Jo Anne	3	0	3	0.9%	280	81.6%
Lester, Frederick	3	0	3	0.9%	283	82.5%
Zaretsky, Allen J.	3	0	3	0.9%	286	83.4%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Aramini, Mary E.	2	1	3	0.9%	289	84.3%
Khuns, Kevin M.	2	1	3	0.9%	292	85.1%
Pullano, Peter J.	2	1	3	0.9%	295	86.0%
Regenstreif, Jeffrey G.	2	1	3	0.9%	298	86.9%
Aureli, Daniel L.	2	0	2	0.6%	300	87.5%
Burke, Adrian J.	2	0	2	0.6%	302	88.0%
Cianca, Mark F.	2	0	2	0.6%	304	88.6%
Colombo, Jeanne M.	2	0	2	0.6%	306	89.2%
Lappan, James	2	0	2	0.6%	308	89.8%
Renzi, Alexander R.	2	0	2	0.6%	310	90.4%
Solomon, R. Adrian	2	0	2	0.6%	312	91.0%
Wisner, Todd J.W.	2	0	2	0.6%	314	91.5%
Kasperek, Lawrence L.	0	2	2	0.6%	316	92.1%
LaDuca, Anthony	0	2	2	0.6%	318	92.7%
Buettner, Brian C.	1	0	1	0.3%	319	93.0%
Dedes, William C.	1	0	1	0.3%	320	93.3%
Flowerday, Michael D.	1	0	1	0.3%	321	93.6%
Hanlon, Garry Stephen	1	0	1	0.3%	322	93.9%
Jones, Jr., Michael A.	1	0	1	0.3%	323	94.2%
Morabito, David R.	1	0	1	0.3%	324	94.5%
Murante, David A.	1	0	1	0.3%	325	94.8%
Murray, D. Michael	1	0	1	0.3%	326	95.0%
Stacy, Michael P.	1	0	1	0.3%	327	95.3%
Strazzeri, Francis A.	1	0	1	0.3%	328	95.6%
Bernacki, Jr., John E.	0	1	1	0.3%	329	95.9%
Coletti, David R.	0	1	1	0.3%	330	96.2%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Conaty, Jr., George W.	0	1	1	0.3%	331	96.5%
Donsky, Steven M.	0	1	1	0.3%	332	96.8%
Keller, Kenneth C.	0	1	1	0.3%	333	97.1%
LaBue, Eugene P.	0	1	1	0.3%	334	97.4%
Muldoon, Gary	0	1	1	0.3%	335	97.7%
Rath, Timothy C.	0	1	1	0.3%	336	98.0%
Regan, Richard E.	0	1	1	0.3%	337	98.3%
Reyes, Miguel A.	0	1	1	0.3%	338	98.5%
Scibetta, Michael P.	0	1	1	0.3%	339	98.8%
Siragusa, Lisa Serio	0	1	1	0.3%	340	99.1%
Spoto, David	0	1	1	0.3%	341	99.4%
West, John R.	0	1	1	0.3%	342	99.7%
Zimmermann, Jr., Clark J.	0	1	1	0.3%	343	100.0%
Grand Total	254	89	343			

2001 Misdemeanor Assignments

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Merante, Vincent E.	17	10	27	2.8%	27	2.8%
Schiano, Christopher	12	15	27	2.8%	54	5.5%
Garretson, Scott A.	22	3	25	2.5%	79	8.1%
Krane, Joel N.	22	2	24	2.4%	103	10.5%
Owens, David L.	21	2	23	2.3%	126	12.8%
Hinman, James S.	20	2	22	2.2%	148	15.1%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
DiSalvo, Thomas J.	19	1	20	2.0%	168	17.1%
Shulman, Brian J.	9	10	19	1.9%	187	19.1%
Crimi, Jr., Charles F.	17	0	17	1.7%	204	20.8%
Crimi, Joseph P.	16	0	16	1.6%	220	22.4%
Perez, Gilbert R.	16	0	16	1.6%	236	24.1%
Lester, Frederick	14	2	16	1.6%	252	25.7%
Pilato, Louis P.	11	5	16	1.6%	268	27.3%
Hurwitz, Phillip R.	14	1	15	1.5%	283	28.8%
Chait, Mitchell A.	12	3	15	1.5%	298	30.4%
Funk, Mark D.	13	1	14	1.4%	312	31.8%
Wisner, Todd J.W.	13	1	14	1.4%	326	33.2%
Holliday, Billie D.	12	2	14	1.4%	340	34.7%
Sadinsky, Lisa A.	13	0	13	1.3%	353	36.0%
Schiano, Jr., Charles A.	12	1	13	1.3%	366	37.3%
Buettner, Brian C.	12	0	12	1.2%	378	38.5%
Leegant, Jo Anne	12	0	12	1.2%	390	39.8%
Maggio, Frank G.	12	0	12	1.2%	402	41.0%
Shapiro, Robert A.	11	1	12	1.2%	414	42.2%
Schiano, Michael P.	10	2	12	1.2%	426	43.4%
Scibetta, Michael P.	9	3	12	1.2%	438	44.6%
Farrell, Barbara E.	8	4	12	1.2%	450	45.9%
Obiorah, Edwin S.C.	8	4	12	1.2%	462	47.1%
Goldman, Ronald S.	11	0	11	1.1%	473	48.2%
Khuns, Kevin M.	11	0	11	1.1%	484	49.3%
Napier, James A.	11	0	11	1.1%	495	50.5%
O'Toole, Keith	11	0	11	1.1%	506	51.6%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Wood, Robert W.	11	0	11	1.1%	517	52.7%
Parks, Anthony	10	1	11	1.1%	528	53.8%
Redmond, Gregg H.	10	1	11	1.1%	539	54.9%
Egger, Jan P.	10	0	10	1.0%	549	56.0%
LaCelle, Erik C.	10	0	10	1.0%	559	57.0%
Bernacki, Jr., John E.	8	2	10	1.0%	569	58.0%
Dimassimo, James D.	9	0	9	0.9%	578	58.9%
Flowerday, Michael D.	9	0	9	0.9%	587	59.8%
Jain, Rekha	9	0	9	0.9%	596	60.8%
Pennica, Kenneth L.	9	0	9	0.9%	605	61.7%
Proano, Galo M.	9	0	9	0.9%	614	62.6%
Solomon, R. Adrian	9	0	9	0.9%	623	63.5%
Summers, Reed Noble	9	0	9	0.9%	632	64.4%
Annechino, John A.	8	1	9	0.9%	641	65.3%
Lappan, James	4	5	9	0.9%	650	66.3%
Anderson, Christopher	8	0	8	0.8%	658	67.1%
Bourtis, Eftihia	8	0	8	0.8%	666	67.9%
Dedes, William C.	8	0	8	0.8%	674	68.7%
Gladstone, Katherine	8	0	8	0.8%	682	69.5%
King, Jr., William H.	8	0	8	0.8%	690	70.3%
LaDuca, John J.	8	0	8	0.8%	698	71.2%
O'Neill, Jr., Raymond B.	8	0	8	0.8%	706	72.0%
Rizzo, James J.	8	0	8	0.8%	714	72.8%
Santariello, Michael	8	0	8	0.8%	722	73.6%
Kristal, Peter L.	7	1	8	0.8%	730	74.4%
Aureli, Daniel L.	3	5	8	0.8%	738	75.2%

Attorney	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Rose, Angelo A.	1	7	8	0.8%	746	76.0%
Vacca, James P.	7	0	7	0.7%	753	76.8%
Karatas, Nigos	6	1	7	0.7%	760	77.5%
Sekharan, Raja N.	5	2	7	0.7%	767	78.2%
Bitetti, Gary	4	3	7	0.7%	774	78.9%
Alquist, Mark H.	6	0	6	0.6%	780	79.5%
Bertram, Dudley M.	6	0	6	0.6%	786	80.1%
Colombo, Jeanne M.	6	0	6	0.6%	792	80.7%
Cooper, Jennie M.	6	0	6	0.6%	798	81.3%
Gaesser, David A.	6	0	6	0.6%	804	82.0%
LaBue, Eugene P.	6	0	6	0.6%	810	82.6%
Lahman, Janice A.	6	0	6	0.6%	816	83.2%
Thompson, Donald M.	6	0	6	0.6%	822	83.8%
Cocuzzi, Thomas J.	3	3	6	0.6%	828	84.4%
West, John R.	2	4	6	0.6%	834	85.0%
Bryant, Kevin C.	5	0	5	0.5%	839	85.5%
Gross, Bryon W.	5	0	5	0.5%	844	86.0%
Infantino, Marc	5	0	5	0.5%	849	86.5%
Levitsky, Steven Brian	5	0	5	0.5%	854	87.1%
Renzi, Alexander R.	5	0	5	0.5%	859	87.6%
Aramini, Mary E.	4	1	5	0.5%	864	88.1%
Murante, David A.	4	1	5	0.5%	869	88.6%
Hanlon, Garry Stephen	3	2	5	0.5%	874	89.1%
Arena, Patrick M.	4	0	4	0.4%	878	89.5%
Brooker, James G.	4	0	4	0.4%	882	89.9%
Cianca, Mark F.	4	0	4	0.4%	886	90.3%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
DeJohn, Timothy W.	4	0	4	0.4%	890	90.7%
Dinolfo, Joseph F.	4	0	4	0.4%	894	91.1%
Jones, Jr., Michael A.	4	0	4	0.4%	898	91.5%
Kosoff-Roth, Karen L.	4	0	4	0.4%	902	91.9%
Zimmermann, Jr., Clark J.	2	2	4	0.4%	906	92.4%
Donsky, Steven M.	1	3	4	0.4%	910	92.8%
Regan, Richard E.	0	4	4	0.4%	914	93.2%
Album, Betsy L.	3	0	3	0.3%	917	93.5%
Burke, Adrian J.	3	0	3	0.3%	920	93.8%
Hardies, Robert M.	3	0	3	0.3%	923	94.1%
Parrinello, J. Matthew	3	0	3	0.3%	926	94.4%
Teator, Mary E.	3	0	3	0.3%	929	94.7%
Tuohey, Michael J.	3	0	3	0.3%	932	95.0%
Zaretsky, Allen J.	3	0	3	0.3%	935	95.3%
Stacy, Michael P.	2	1	3	0.3%	938	95.6%
Barr, Culver K.	1	2	3	0.3%	941	95.9%
D'Arpino, John Joseph	1	2	3	0.3%	944	96.2%
Kasperek, Lawrence L.	1	2	3	0.3%	947	96.5%
Damelio, Joseph S.	0	3	3	0.3%	950	96.8%
Dick, Andrew J.	2	0	2	0.2%	952	97.0%
Morabito, David R.	2	0	2	0.2%	954	97.2%
Murray, D. Michael	2	0	2	0.2%	956	97.5%
Regenstreif, Jeffrey G.	2	0	2	0.2%	958	97.7%
Daniele, Anthony	1	1	2	0.2%	960	97.9%
Goldberg, Richard A.	0	2	2	0.2%	962	98.1%
Keller, Kenneth C.	0	2	2	0.2%	964	98.3%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Spoto, David	0	2	2	0.2%	966	98.5%
Goel, Vinita	1	0	1	0.1%	967	98.6%
Hilderbrandt, Randall D.	1	0	1	0.1%	968	98.7%
Pullano, Peter J.	1	0	1	0.1%	969	98.8%
Salamone, Jr., James D.	1	0	1	0.1%	970	98.9%
Shukoff, Igor	1	0	1	0.1%	971	99.0%
Winward, Thomas M.V.	1	0	1	0.1%	972	99.1%
Coletti, David R.	0	1	1	0.1%	973	99.2%
Getz, Jon P.	0	1	1	0.1%	974	99.3%
LaDuca, Anthony	0	1	1	0.1%	975	99.4%
Mahan, Francis B.	0	1	1	0.1%	976	99.5%
Mastrella, Daniel J.	0	1	1	0.1%	977	99.6%
Rath, Timothy C.	0	1	1	0.1%	978	99.7%
Reyes, Miguel A.	0	1	1	0.1%	979	99.8%
Siragusa, Lisa Serio	0	1	1	0.1%	980	99.9%
Young, D. Scott	0	1	1	0.1%	981	100.0%
Grand Total	831	150	981			

2001 Family Court Assignments





	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Sadinsky, Lisa A.	1	139	140	11.5%	140	11.5%
Lester, Frederick	0	120	120	9.9%	260	21.4%
Hinman, James S.	5	69	74	6.1%	334	27.5%
Funk, Mark D.	1	66	67	5.5%	401	33.0%
DiSalvo, Thomas J.	2	56	58	4.8%	459	37.7%
Hilderbrandt, Randall D.	1	55	56	4.6%	515	42.4%
Leavy, Anthony	0	52	52	4.3%	567	46.6%
Levitsky, Steven Brian	0	50	50	4.1%	617	50.7%
Karatas, Nigos	0	49	49	4.0%	666	54.8%
Martin, Thomas N.	0	46	46	3.8%	712	58.6%
Callanan, Karen Smith	0	40	40	3.3%	752	61.8%
Proano, Galo M.	2	34	36	3.0%	788	64.8%
Perez, Gilbert R.	3	29	32	2.6%	820	67.4%
Gladstone, Katherine	1	29	30	2.5%	850	69.9%
Chait, Mitchell A.	0	27	27	2.2%	877	72.1%
Farrell, Barbara E.	0	21	21	1.7%	898	73.8%
King, Jr., William H.	2	15	17	1.4%	915	75.2%
Annechino, John A.	2	13	15	1.2%	930	76.5%
Crimi, Joseph P.	1	13	14	1.2%	944	77.6%
Jain, Rekha	1	11	12	1.0%	956	78.6%
Nesser, Joseph G.	1	11	12	1.0%	968	79.6%
Dentino, Anthony A.	0	12	12	1.0%	980	80.6%
St. George, Robert J.	0	11	11	0.9%	991	81.5%
Winward, Thomas M.V.	1	9	10	0.8%	1001	82.3%
Aramini, Mary E.	0	10	10	0.8%	1011	83.1%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Shulman, Brian J.	0	9	9	0.7%	1020	83.9%
DeJohn, Timothy W.	0	8	8	0.7%	1028	84.5%
Farr, William H.	0	8	8	0.7%	1036	85.2%
Schiano, Margaret A.	0	8	8	0.7%	1044	85.9%
Buettner, Brian C.	2	5	7	0.6%	1051	86.4%
Obiorah, Edwin S.C.	0	7	7	0.6%	1058	87.0%
Schell, Jr., George A.	0	7	7	0.6%	1065	87.6%
Arena, Patrick M.	0	6	6	0.5%	1071	88.1%
Lahman, Janice A.	0	6	6	0.5%	1077	88.6%
Merkel-McMillan, Hilary	0	6	6	0.5%	1083	89.1%
Alexander, Christopher M.	0	5	5	0.4%	1088	89.5%
Beretta, Frank	0	5	5	0.4%	1093	89.9%
Berkowitz, Joyce B.	0	5	5	0.4%	1098	90.3%
Indivino, Deborah A.	0	5	5	0.4%	1103	90.7%
Jackson, LaMarr J.	0	5	5	0.4%	1108	91.1%
Pappalardo, Fauna M.	0	5	5	0.4%	1113	91.5%
Rose, Angelo A.	0	5	5	0.4%	1118	91.9%
Tirone, Gregg M.	0	5	5	0.4%	1123	92.4%
Holliday, Billie D.	2	2	4	0.3%	1127	92.7%
Schell, George A.	1	3	4	0.3%	1131	93.0%
Wisner, Todd J.W.	1	3	4	0.3%	1135	93.3%
Aquilina, Vivian M.	0	4	4	0.3%	1139	93.7%
Khuns, Kevin M.	1	2	3	0.2%	1142	93.9%
Colombo, Jeanne M.	0	3	3	0.2%	1145	94.2%
Cooper, Jennie M.	0	3	3	0.2%	1148	94.4%
Gaesser, David A.	0	3	3	0.2%	1151	94.7%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Offen, Alan L.	0	3	3	0.2%	1154	94.9%
Pappalardo, P. Frank	0	3	3	0.2%	1157	95.1%
Scibetta, Michael P.	0	3	3	0.2%	1160	95.4%
Stacy, Michael P.	0	3	3	0.2%	1163	95.6%
Dimassimo, James D.	2	0	2	0.2%	1165	95.8%
Kristal, Peter L.	1	1	2	0.2%	1167	96.0%
Bryant, Kevin C.	0	2	2	0.2%	1169	96.1%
Hurwitz, Phillip R.	0	2	2	0.2%	1171	96.3%
Laragy, Christopher J.	0	2	2	0.2%	1173	96.5%
Nacca, John	0	2	2	0.2%	1175	96.6%
Nevarez, Juan A.	0	2	2	0.2%	1177	96.8%
Renzi, Alexander R.	0	2	2	0.2%	1179	97.0%
Reyes, Miguel A.	0	2	2	0.2%	1181	97.1%
Rizzo, James J.	0	2	2	0.2%	1183	97.3%
Sciortino, Michael A.	0	2	2	0.2%	1185	97.5%
Sekharan, Raja N.	0	2	2	0.2%	1187	97.6%
Stewart, Henry S.	0	2	2	0.2%	1189	97.8%
Bernacki, Jr., John E.	1	0	1	0.1%	1190	97.9%
Blue, Tyson	1	0	1	0.1%	1191	97.9%
Sammons, Elizabeth A.	1	0	1	0.1%	1192	98.0%
West, John R.	1	0	1	0.1%	1193	98.1%
Alexson, Timothy L.	0	1	1	0.1%	1194	98.2%
Ashcraft, Sara Stout	0	1	1	0.1%	1195	98.3%
Bullard, H. Todd	0	1	1	0.1%	1196	98.4%
Dinolfo, Joseph F.	0	1	1	0.1%	1197	98.4%
Flowerday, Michael D.	0	1	1	0.1%	1198	98.5%

	Assigned By		Grand	% of	Running	Running
Attorney	ACP	Court	Total	Total	Total	%
Gaul, Annette	0	1	1	0.1%	1199	98.6%
Ingersoll, Timothy E.	0	1	1	0.1%	1200	98.7%
Kosoff-Roth, Karen L.	0	1	1	0.1%	1201	98.8%
Leichtner, Edward J.	0	1	1	0.1%	1202	98.8%
Morabito, David R.	0	1	1	0.1%	1203	98.9%
Morris, Lisa B.	0	1	1	0.1%	1204	99.0%
Owens, David L.	0	1	1	0.1%	1205	99.1%
Pappalardo, Jr., Frank S.	0	1	1	0.1%	1206	99.2%
Ryan, Diana Deyo	0	1	1	0.1%	1207	99.3%
Schiano, Christopher	0	1	1	0.1%	1208	99.3%
Shapiro, Melvin G.	0	1	1	0.1%	1209	99.4%
Snodgrass, Cynthia L.	0	1	1	0.1%	1210	99.5%
Solomon, Thomas Jay	0	1	1	0.1%	1211	99.6%
Teator, Mary E.	0	1	1	0.1%	1212	99.7%
Thompson, Donald M.	0	1	1	0.1%	1213	99.8%
Vazzana, James A.	0	1	1	0.1%	1214	99.8%
Waldman, Christina G.	0	1	1	0.1%	1215	99.9%
Waters, Alison	0	1	1	0.1%	1216	100.0%
Grand Total	38	1178	1216			

2001 Case Distribution Graphs¹



1. In interpreting these graphs, keep in mind that new panel members, non-approved attorneys, attorneys declining assignments and attorneys temporarily removed from the panels skew the results.

2001 Table of Program Use by Judiciary

The table below shows the number of assignments for each Judge making at least one assignment during 2001. The table divides the assignments between those made through the Assigned Counsel Program and those made directly by the Judge. The last column shows the percentage of the total assignments that the Judge made through the Assigned Counsel Program. The statistics clearly show that Rochester City Court, which assigns the greatest number of cases in the County, is very high in percentage of cases assigned through the Assigned Counsel Program. Increasingly in 2001, the Local Criminal Courts assigned exclusively through the Assigned Counsel Program. These facts directly correlate to the fact that the distribution of cases among the attorneys is greatest for criminal cases. Conversely, the statistics show that Family Court has a very low percentage of cases assigned through the Assigned Counsel Program. Therefore, Family Court has a very uneven distribution of cases among the attorneys.

Name	Judge	ACP	Court	Grand Total
Appellate Division	Appellate Division	55	2	57
Appellate Division Total		55	2	57
Brighton Town Court	Morris, Hon. James E.	13	0	13
	Morris, Hon. Karen	12	1	13
Brighton Town Court Total		25	1	26
Chili Town Court	Olver, Hon. Melvin L.	3	8	11
	Pietropaoli, Hon. Patrick	3	5	8
Chili Town Court Total		6	13	19
E. Rochester Town Court	Morabito, Hon. Ralph	0	8	8
	Odorisi, Hon. J. Scott	1	3	4
E. Rochester Town Court Total		1	11	12
Fairport Village Court	Barone, Hon. Vincent M.	3	0	3
Fairport Village Court Total		3	0	3




Name	Judge	ACP	Court	Grand Total
Family Court Hearing Officer	Bonadio, Hon. Anthony F.	0	2	2
	Gordon, Hon. Julie Anne	0	183	183
	Miller, Hon. Michael J.	0	14	14
	Morton, Hon. Glenn R.	0	12	12
	Polito, Hon. Thomas W.	1	12	13
	Strobridge, Hon. Maurice E.	0	32	32
	Willis, Hon. Charles L.	0	6	6
Family Court Hearing Officer Total		1	261	262
Gates Town Court	Pisaturo, Hon. John J.	10	13	23
	Pupatelli, Hon. Peter P.	1	8	9
Gates Town Court Total		11	21	32
Greece Town Court	Campbell, Hon. Vincent	28	0	28
	Diraddo, Hon. Raymond S.	29	0	29
	Rogers, Hon. Charles W.	21	0	21
Greece Town Court Total		78	0	78
Hamlin Town Court	Rath, Hon. Paul W.	3	0	3
	Wright, Hon. Gordon	1	0	1
Hamlin Town Court Total		4	0	4
Henrietta Town Court	Kopacki, Hon. John	5	35	40
	Pericak, Hon. John G.	7	11	18
	Renzi, Hon. Alexander	2	19	21
Henrietta Town Court Total		14	65	79
Irondequoit Town Court	Dinolfo, Hon. Vincent M.	6	18	24
	Enos, Hon. Christopher J.	30	13	43
	Genier, Hon. Joseph T.	28	3	31
Irondequoit Town Court Total		64	34	98

Name	Judge	ACP	Court	Grand Total
Monroe County Court	Bellini, Hon. Elma A.	28	39	67
	Connell, Hon. John J.	25	28	53
	Geraci, Jr., Hon. Frank P.	44	2	46
	Kohout, Hon. Joan S.	12	14	26
	Maloy, Hon. Charles T.	51	30	81
	Marks, Hon. Patricia D.	13	32	45
Monroe County Court Total		173	145	318
Monroe County Family Court	Donofrio, Hon. Gail	2	135	137
	Keenan, Hon. Richard A.	4	133	137
	Kohout, Hon. Joan S.	20	59	79
	Nesbitt, Hon. John B.	0	53	53
	O'Connor, Hon. Marilyn Hoffman	0	166	166
	Rivoli, Hon. John J.	0	68	68
	Sciolino, Hon. Anthony J.	2	106	108
	Taddeo, Hon. Ann Marie	4	193	197
Monroe County Family Court Total		32	913	945
Monroe County Surrogate Court	Calvaruso, Hon. Edmund A.	0	2	2
Monroe County Surrogate Total		0	2	2
Ogden Town Court	Murante, Hon. David A.	7	0	7
	Schiano, Hon. Michael Patrick	10	0	10
Ogden Town Court Total		17	0	17
Parma Town Court	Mullaly, Hon. Kathleen	1	0	1
	Sciortino, Hon. Michael A.	1	0	1
Parma Town Court Total		2	0	2

Name	Judge	ACP	Court	Grand Total
Penfield Town Court	Farber, Hon. Sidney T.	15	1	16
	Lomenzo, Jr., Hon. John P.	10	0	10
Penfield Town Court Total		25	1	26
Perinton Town Court	Arnold, Hon. Michael H.	7	1	8
	Klonick, Hon. Thomas A	1	0	1
Perinton Town Court Total		8	1	9
Pittsford Town Court	Gallina, Hon. Fred S.	13	2	15
	Michel, Hon. F. Robert	6	0	6
Pittsford Town Court Total		19	2	21
Riga Town Court	Amarosa, Hon. Louis	6	1	7
	Steinwachs, Hon. Joseph	3	0	3
Riga Town Court Total		9	1	10
Rochester City Court	Byrnes, Hon. Marjorie L.	195	5	200
	Castro, Hon. Melchor E.	285	49	334
	Johnson, Hon. Teresa D.	403	4	407
	King, Hon. Roy Wheatley	294	4	298
	Morse, Hon. Thomas Rainbow	266	16	282
	Pfeiffer, Hon. Ann E.	234	18	252
	Pietropaoli, Hon. Patrick	1	11	12
	Schwartz, Hon. John R.	165	6	171
	Valentino, Hon. Joseph D.	46	0	46
Rochester City Court Total		1889	113	2002
Rush Town Court	Anderson, Hon. Paula	2	0	2
Rush Town Court Total		2	0	2

Name	Judge	ACP	Court	Grand Total
Supreme Court	Affronti, Hon. Francis A.	7	1	8
	Cornelius, Hon. Raymond E.	0	2	2
	Fisher, Hon. Kenneth R.	1	2	3
	Mark, Hon. Donald J.	16	10	26
	Vanstrydonck, Hon. Thomas M.	1	8	9
Supreme Court Total		25	23	48
Sweden Town Court	Coapman, Hon. Carl A.	14	0	14
	Cody, Hon. William J.	3	0	3
	Depferd, Hon. Mark R.	9	0	9
Sweden Town Court Total		26	0	26
Webster Town Court	Barrett, Hon. John M.	1	0	1
	Corretore, Hon. David	9	0	9
	DiSalvo, Hon. Thomas J.	8	0	8
Webster Town Court Total		18	0	18
Grand Total		2507	1609	4116

Graphs of Program Use by Judiciary



Types of Cases Assigned in 2001¹

Type of Case	Total
Child Protective Proceeding	481
Custody/Visitation	461
Petit Larceny	198
Crim. Poss. Controlled Substance 3	191
Assault 3	149
Family Offense	144
Violation Probation	126
Harassment 2	119
Criminal Mischief 4	102
Crim. Poss. Controlled Substance 7	97
Robbery 1	84
Parole Violation	78
Unauthorized Use Motor Vehicle 3	71
Crim. Poss. Stolen Property 4	67
Assault 2	66
Loitering 1	59
Crim. Poss. Weapon 2	59
Criminal Contempt 2	57
Crim. Sale of Controlled Substance 3	52
Criminal Contempt 1	47
Burglary 2	47

¹ Based on cases referred to ACP for assignment. Assignment numbers are higher because during the pendency of a referred case, more than one attorney may be assigned to that case.

Type of Case	Total
Menacing 2	43
Disorderly Conduct	42
Grand Larceny 4	41
Agg. Unlicensed Operation 2	40
Robbery 2	38
Agg. Unlicensed Operation 3	33
Agg. Harassment 2	33
Crim. Poss. Marihuana 5	33
Crim. Poss. Stolen Property 5	28
Criminal Mischief 3	27
Appeal-Criminal Court (Fel.)	27
Unlawful Poss. Marihuana	27
Burglary 3	27
Crim. Poss. Weapon 3	25
Crim. Poss. Forged Instrument 2	25
Witness	24
Forgery 2	24
Rape 1	23
Driving While Intoxicated	22
Burglary 1	21
Murder 2	19
Resisting Arrest	18
False Personation	17
Paternity	17
Crim. Poss. Marihuana 4	16
Foster Care	15
Crim. Sale Marihuana 4	15

Type of Case	Total
Poss. Imitation Controlled Substance	15
Crim. Poss. Weapon 4	14
Grand Larceny 3	14
Assault 1	13
Reckless Endangerment 1	13
Crim. Poss. Stolen Property 3	13
Guardianship	12
End. Welfare Child	12
Obstructing Gov't'l Administration 2	11
Crim. Trespass 2	10
Crim. Trespass 3	10
Robbery 3	9
Reckless Endangerment 2	9
Appeal-Family Court	9
Theft of Services	8
Criminal Impersonation 2	8
Prostitution	8
Trespass	7
Robbery 1, Att.	7
Issuing a Bad Check	7
Driving While Intoxicated (Fel.)	6
Sexual Abuse 1	6
Criminal Facilitation 4	6
Crim. Sale of Controlled Substance 2	6
Poss. Burglar's Tools	6
Crim. Poss. Controlled Substance 1	5
Crim. Sale of Controlled Substance 1	5

Type of Case	Total
722-c Order	5
Crim. Use Drug Paraphernalia 2	4
Falsely Reporting Incident 3	4
Adoption	4
Crim. Poss. Marihuana 3	4
Support	4
Sodomy 1	4
Promoting Prison Contraband 2	4
Rape 2	3
Welfare Fraud - Fel.	3
Agg. Unlicensed Operation 1	3
Tampering Physical Evidence	3
Crim. Poss. Controlled Substance 2	3
Selling Tobacco to Mino - 2	3
Robbery 2, Att.	3
Public Lewdness	3
Prohibited Use of Weapon	3
Crim. Use Firearm 2	3
Criminal Contempt 1, Aggravated	3
Fail Exercise Control of	3
Loitering to Promote Prostitution	3
Burglary 2, Att.	2
Suspended Registration	2
Sexual Abuse 2	2
Conspiracy 2	2
Murder 1	2
Crim. Use Firearm 1	2

Type of Case	Total
Alcoholic Beverage Control	2
Harassment	2
File False Written Statment	2
Petit Larceny, Att.	2
Driving While Ability Impaired-Drugs	2
Escape 2	1
Burglary 1, Att.	1
Bail Jumping 3	1
Fugitive	1
Tampering with Witness 3	1
Sexual Abuse 3	1
Conspiracy 4	1
Conspiracy 6	1
Stalking 4	1
Bail Jumping 2	1
Auto Strip 2	1
Assault 1, Att.	1
Arson 4	1
Arson 3	1
Tampering With Witness 4	1
Appeal-Criminal Court (Misd.)	1
Unlawful Imprisonment 2	1
Appeal - Parole Violation	1
Unlawfully Dealing With Child	1
Unlicensed Operator	1
Unregistered Vehicle	1
Forgery 3	1

Type of Case	Total
Exposure of Person	1
Post-Conviction Motion	1
Menacing	1
Mental Health - Article 81	1
Criminal Facilitation 3	1
Mental Health Retention	1
Loitering	1
Murder 1, Att.	1
Crim. Use Drug Paraphernalia 1	1
Non-Support of a Child	1
Offering False Instrument for Filing 1	1
Crim. Tamp 2	1
Patronizing a Prostitute 4	1
Pins-Intervenor/FC	1
Sex Offender Registration	1
Crim. Sale Marihuana 2	1
Course of Sexual Conduct 1st	1
Custodial Interference 2	1
Promoting Prison Contraband 1	1
Leaving Scene Incident-PD	1
Judicial Contempt (Judiciary Sec. 750)	1
Rape 1, Att.	1
Falsely Reporting Incident 1	1
Crim. Poss. Marihuana 2	1
Crim. Poss. Hypodermic Instrument	1
Robbery 3, Att.	1
Hindering Prosecution 1	1

Type of Case	Total
Criminal Mischief 1, ATT	1
Crim. Poss. Controlled Substance 5	1
Rioting 2	1
Poss. Alcohol By Minor	1

2001 Case Costs by Panel²

Panel		Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Totals
ABC Felony	Total	\$3,336	\$344,852	\$57,864	\$406,052
	Average	\$6	\$579	\$97	\$735
	# Cases	596	596	596	596
Appellate	Total	\$4,023	\$85,037	\$10,261	\$99,320
	Average	\$58	\$1,232	\$149	\$1,493
	# Cases	69	69	69	69
DE Felony	Total	\$570	\$145,980	\$8,943	\$155,493
	Average	\$2	\$398	\$24	\$477
	# Cases	367	367	367	367
Family Court	Total	\$3,131	\$313,139	\$7,730	\$324,000
	Average	\$3	\$317	\$8	\$382
	# Cases	987	987	987	987
Misdemeanor	Total	\$1,926	\$330,320	\$7,434	\$339,680
	Average	\$2	\$273	\$6	\$334
	# Cases	1209	1209	1209	1209
Other	Total	\$34	\$9,637	\$3,358	\$13,029
	Average	\$1	\$275	\$96	\$426
	# Cases	35	35	35	35
Probation/Parole	Total	\$166	\$44,092	\$1,160	\$45,418

² Includes all cases closed and paid in 2001 even if assigned in a prior year.

	Average	\$1	\$264	\$7	\$325
	# Cases	167	167	167	167
2001 Administrative Costs		\$182,673			
Total Cases Closed 2001		3430			
Administrative Cost/Case		\$53.26			

2001 Costs by Case Disposition

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
ABC Felony	Bench Trial - Acquittal	Fees	\$70	\$11,594	\$1,926	\$13,589
		# Cases	1	5	3	9
	Bench Trial - Guilty Original	Fees		\$3,115	\$622	\$3,737
		# Cases		1	1	2
	Bench Warrant	Fees	\$17	\$6,368	\$952	\$7,337
		# Cases	4	10	1	15
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees	\$256	\$6,247	\$1,039	\$7,543
		# Cases	10	34	2	46
	Consolidated - Other Charges	Fees	\$2	\$1,416	\$1,712	\$3,129
		# Cases	3	10	1	14
	Dismissed - CPL 30.30	Fees	\$22	\$4,098	\$352	\$4,472
		# Cases	2	14	2	18
	Dismissed - Felony Complaint	Fees	\$20	\$2,599	\$522	\$3,141
		# Cases	4	12	1	17
	Dismissed - Indictment	Fees	\$248	\$7,599	\$310	\$8,157
		# Cases	2	5	1	8
	Dismissed - Information	Fees	\$21	\$2,823		\$2,844
		# Cases	2	5		7

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Dismissed - Plea in Other Court	Fees	\$10	\$4,237		\$4,247
		# Cases	1	13		14
	Jury Trial - Acquittal	Fees	\$329	\$15,472	\$5,400	\$21,202
		# Cases	3	6	9	18
	Jury Trial - Guilty Lesser	Fees	\$375	\$14,655	\$4,447	\$19,477
		# Cases	7	7	7	21
	Jury Trial - Guilty Original	Fees	\$287	\$52,147	\$16,617	\$69,051
		# Cases	7	18	15	40
	No Bill - Grand Jury	Fees	\$197	\$33,373	\$2,490	\$36,059
		# Cases	36	140	17	193
	No Conflict - PD Continued	Fees		\$327		\$327
		# Cases		2		2
	Not Indigent	Fees	\$15	\$591		\$606
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Other	Fees		\$608		\$608
		# Cases		1		1
	Plea To Reduced Charge	Fees	\$651	\$123,623	\$6,965	\$131,239
		# Cases	63	214	29	306
	Plea To Top Charge	Fees	\$543	\$34,652	\$4,077	\$39,272
		# Cases	18	37	12	67
	Transfer to Family Court	Fees	\$3	\$509		\$511
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Y.O. Adjudication	Fees	\$93	\$11,392	\$310	\$11,794
		# Cases	7	22	3	32
Appellate	Appeal Judgement - Discontinued	Fees		\$956		\$956
		# Cases		2		2

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Appeal Judgment - Affirmed	Fees	\$3,508	\$69,611	\$1,900	\$75,019
		# Cases	36	44	9	89
	Appeal Judgment - Modified	Fees	\$115	\$2,810		\$2,925
		# Cases	1	2		3
	Appeal Judgment - Reversed	Fees	\$55	\$6,172	\$484	\$6,711
		# Cases	1	3	1	5
	Appeal Sentence - Affirmed	Fees	\$345	\$2,012	\$282	\$2,639
		# Cases	3	1	2	6
	Petition Dismissed	Fees		\$1,300	\$375	\$1,674
		# Cases		3	1	4
DE Felony	A.C.D.	Fees	\$11	\$1,156		\$1,167
		# Cases	2	3		5
	Alford Plea	Fees		\$830		\$830
		# Cases		1		1
	Bench Trial - Acquittal	Fees		\$945	\$154	\$1,099
		# Cases		1	1	2
	Bench Warrant	Fees	\$7	\$1,936		\$1,943
		# Cases	4	3		7
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees	\$11	\$4,913	\$130	\$5,055
		# Cases	3	18	2	23
	Consolidated - Other Charges	Fees		\$724	\$255	\$979
		# Cases		5	1	6
	Dismissed - CPL 30.30	Fees	\$23	\$3,757	\$90	\$3,871
		# Cases	3	8	1	12
	Dismissed - Felony Complaint	Fees	\$23	\$2,077		\$2,100
		# Cases	5	8		13

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Dismissed - Indictment	Fees	\$2	\$778		\$779
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Dismissed - Information	Fees	\$25	\$1,427		\$1,452
		# Cases	2	3		5
	Dismissed - Plea in Other Court	Fees		\$3,414		\$3,414
		# Cases		15		15
	Jury Trial - Guilty Lesser	Fees	\$11	\$6,705	\$394	\$7,110
		# Cases	2	3	1	6
	Jury Trial - Guilty Original	Fees	\$32	\$5,981	\$1,122	\$7,134
		# Cases	2	4	2	8
	No Bill - Grand Jury	Fees	\$75	\$18,722	\$1,040	\$19,838
		# Cases	16	74	8	98
	No Conflict - PD Continued	Fees		\$430		\$430
		# Cases		2		2
	Plea To Reduced Charge	Fees	\$219	\$53,372	\$642	\$54,233
		# Cases	42	124	6	172
	Plea To Top Charge	Fees	\$108	\$28,919	\$3,279	\$32,306
		# Cases	17	50	3	70
	Post Conviction - Denied	Fees	\$5	\$148		\$153
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Relieved By Court	Fees		\$120		\$120
		# Cases		1		1
	Stipulated Settlement	Fees	\$7	\$1,023		\$1,029
		# Cases	1	2		3
	Transfer to Family Court	Fees		\$370		\$370
		# Cases		1		1

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Y.O. Adjudication	Fees	\$3	\$7,057	\$22	\$7,082
		# Cases	2	20	1	23
Family Court	A.C.D.	Fees	\$52	\$6,834	\$258	\$7,144
		# Cases	5	18	3	26
	Admit Petition	Fees	\$61	\$12,204		\$12,265
		# Cases	16	40		56
	Appeal Judgment - Reversed	Fees	\$98	\$336		\$434
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Bench Warrant	Fees		\$1,163		\$1,163
		# Cases		3		3
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees		\$102		\$102
		# Cases		1		1
	Other	Fees		\$230		\$230
		# Cases		1		1
	Petition Dismissed	Fees	\$766	\$54,288	\$618	\$55,672
		# Cases	71	224	4	299
	Petition Found After Hearing	Fees	\$262	\$18,935	\$310	\$19,507
		# Cases	16	37	2	55
	Relieved By Court	Fees		\$485		\$485
		# Cases		1		1
	Stipulated Settlement	Fees	\$1,892	\$216,089	\$1,951	\$219,932
		# Cases	179	581	16	776
Misdemeanor	A.C.D.	Fees	\$286	\$49,033	\$174	\$49,494
		# Cases	52	199	3	254
	Bench Trial - Acquittal	Fees	\$58	\$4,774	\$54	\$4,887
		# Cases	5	14	1	20

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Bench Trial - Guilty Original	Fees		\$375	\$164	\$539
		# Cases		1	1	2
	Bench Warrant	Fees	\$74	\$10,753	\$320	\$11,147
		# Cases	11	39	1	51
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees	\$35	\$1,589		\$1,624
		# Cases	6	13		19
	Consolidated - Other Charges	Fees	\$47	\$7,707		\$7,754
		# Cases	5	31		36
	Dismissed - CPL 30.30	Fees	\$167	\$14,606	\$784	\$15,556
		# Cases	23	70	4	97
	Dismissed - Indictment	Fees		\$479		\$479
		# Cases		1		1
	Dismissed - Information	Fees	\$500	\$45,942	\$358	\$46,800
		# Cases	68	162	5	235
	Dismissed - Plea in Other Court	Fees	\$16	\$8,665		\$8,681
		# Cases	6	44		50
	Jury Trial - Acquittal	Fees	\$112	\$8,754	\$320	\$9,186
		# Cases	4	7	2	13
	Jury Trial - Guilty Original	Fees	\$52	\$9,930	\$4,505	\$14,486
		# Cases	2	8	4	14
	No Bill - Grand Jury	Fees		\$105		\$105
		# Cases		1		1
	No Conflict - PD Continued	Fees	\$13	\$537		\$550
		# Cases	1	4		5
	Plea To Reduced Charge	Fees	\$312	\$96,275	\$175	\$96,762
		# Cases	76	350	4	430

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Plea To Top Charge	Fees	\$213	\$58,775	\$102	\$59,091
		# Cases	40	194	2	236
	Y.O. Adjudication	Fees	\$9	\$7,876		\$7,886
		# Cases	4	27		31
Other	A.C.D.	Fees		\$175		\$175
		# Cases		2		2
	Appeal Judgment - Reversed	Fees		\$1,540		\$1,540
		# Cases		1		1
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees			\$3,358	\$3,358
		# Cases			4	4
	Dismissed - Information	Fees		\$935		\$935
		# Cases		1		1
	No Conflict - PD Continued	Fees		\$96		\$96
		# Cases		1		1
	Other	Fees	\$17	\$3,629		\$3,645
		# Cases	4	22		26
	Plea To Reduced Charge	Fees	\$17	\$540		\$557
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Post Conviction - Denied	Fees		\$2,723		\$2,723
		# Cases		3		3
Probation/Parole	Admit Petition	Fees	\$94	\$31,285	\$788	\$32,167
		# Cases	24	111	5	140
	Bench Warrant	Fees		\$762		\$762
		# Cases		3		3
	Client Retained Own Counsel	Fees		\$199		\$199
		# Cases		3		3

Panel	Disposition	Data	Attorney Expenses	Fees	Vendor Expenses	Grand Total
	Consolidated - Other Charges	Fees	\$3	\$2,071		\$2,074
		# Cases	2	6		8
	Dismissed - Plea in Other Court	Fees		\$488		\$488
		# Cases		3		3
	No Conflict - PD Continued	Fees		\$100		\$100
		# Cases		1		1
	Petition Dismissed	Fees	\$11	\$3,078	\$108	\$3,198
		# Cases	3	13	1	17
	Petition Found After Hearing	Fees	\$16	\$1,852	\$138	\$2,006
		# Cases	2	5	2	9
	Plea To Reduced Charge	Fees	\$1	\$52		\$54
		# Cases	1	1		2
	Plea To Top Charge	Fees	\$3	\$1,445		\$1,448
		# Cases	3	6		9
	Stipulated Settlement	Fees	\$24	\$1,767		\$1,790
		# Cases	3	9		12